

EXHIBIT 14

From: asweeney@cisco.com (Adam Sweeney)
 Subject: RE: Approval for Flexlink CLI commands
 Received(Date): Wed, 07 Apr 2004 20:55:04 GMT

What you are saying is fine with me for the marketing name of the feature. I disagree about how it should be named in the CLI. There are several examples of features where the marketing name for the feature and the CLI syntax for configuring it are not the same. In my opinion, the very natural syntax for this command in IOS is:

switchport backup interface <name>

This makes the similarity in function to the layer 3 interface 'backup interface <name>' command very clear while being very clear that this is the version for switchports rather than layer 3 interfaces.

I agree that CLI naming is very subjective. That's why we have this list. Review in this list gives us a chance to work towards consistency within this very subjective space. In my opinion, syntax consistency with features that have similar function is very important. It's why mac acls and ip acls use very similar syntax structures, for example. In my opinion, this consistency is more important than trying to get people to notice the new CLI. People will not notice your feature just because they trip over it in the CLI among the tens of other commands available to them.

Thanks,

Adam

On Tue, 6 Apr 2004, Scott Lennartz wrote:

> Part of problem may lie in understanding the DSBU market and the motivation
 > for this feature. A small but growing segment of our customers feel
 > STP/RSTP is complicated and/or unreliable. As a result, DSBU is facing
 > pressure from other vendors with niche market solutions such as 3COM, who
 > claim our boxes are too complicated to use (in comparison with their
 > "Resilient Link" feature), and Extreme, who also have a non STP, layer 2
 > redundancy solution ("Ethernet Automatic Protection Switching").
 >
 > It is my belief that any exercise in naming is highly subjective, and there
 > is rarely a "right" answer, but I think that Flex Link is a resonable name
 > for what we are doing; it compares well with competitively named features,
 > it doesn't sound complicated, and it signifies the feature is a new option.
 > The latter is important to help cut through the noise such that the field
 > becomes aware of it.
 >
 > -Scott
 >
 > -----Original Message-----
 > From: Beau James [mailto:bjames@cisco.com]
 > Sent: Monday, April 05, 2004 6:17 PM

> To: bep@cisco.com; murali@cisco.com; uslennar@cisco.com
> Cc: asanyal@cisco.com; asweeney@cisco.com; parser-police@cisco.com;
> ubajaj@cisco.com
> Subject: RE: Approval for Flexlink CLI commands
>
> --> Regarding confusion between Flex Link and Flex WAN, I spoke with
> --> Amit Sanyal (cc'ed here) whose group was responsible for the product
> --> marketing of Flex WAN. He has no issue with the name Flex Link and
> --> does not feel it will cause any market confusion.
>
> Fair enough, no marketing confusion.
>
> But the other feedback from Bruce and me (and others?) still remains.
>
> "Flex Link" does not sound like any kind of alternative to Spanning Tree
> Protocol.
>
> Beau
>
> --> Regards,
> --> Scott
> -->
> --> -----Original Message-----
> --> From: Beau James [mailto:bjames@cisco.com]
> --> Sent: Sunday, April 04, 2004 6:40 PM
> --> To: bep@cisco.com; murali@cisco.com; uslennar@cisco.com
> --> Cc: asweeney@cisco.com; parser-police@cisco.com; ubajaj@cisco.com
> --> Subject: RE: Approval for Flexlink CLI commands
> -->
> --> --> I did not speak with 7600 marketing, but I did contact 6500
> --> --> marketing, whom also support the FlexWAN module, and they had no
> --> issue.
> -->
> --> I am part of the 6500 team. While we support the FlexWAN modules,
> --> we are not the owners of them. The 7600 team are the owners.
> -->
> --> --> In addition, there
> --> --> is a special slot on the 4500 named the Flex Slot and their
> --> --> marketing agreed there was no conflict or confusion.
> --> -->
> --> --> In general, Cisco has many, many products, and as such there are
> --> --> few uniquely descriptive and commonly understood adjectives that
> --> --> remain
> --> unused.
> --> -->
> --> --> In the case of Flex Link, the term flexible is ideal for
> --> --> describing what Flex Link is -- an alternate solution to STP.
> -->
> --> "Flexible Link" is an ideal description of an alternative to
> --> "Spanning Tree Protocol"?
> -->
> --> In what language?
> -->
> --> Beau
> -->
> --> --> Of course we can use another

> --> --> term such as standby or backup, but a backup interface command
> --> --> has existed for a long time; how can we distinguish the new work
> --> --> and functionality we have implemented? Naming every feature the
> --> --> same (i.e. is this the old backup interface of the new
> --> --> interface?) is more a source of confusion than determining the
> --> --> difference between a
> --> --> hardware module and a software feature.
> --> --> It is my opinion, along the GSB and ISBU, that Flex Link is an
> --> --> acceptable name.
> --> -->
> --> --> Regards,
> --> --> Scott
> --> -->
> --> --> P.S. Below is the definition for Flexible, which you can see is
> --> --> a good description of the Flex Link feature.
> --> -->
> --> --> Flexible
> --> -->
> --> --> 1. able to bend without breaking: able to bend or be bent
> --> --> repeatedly without damage or injury
> --> -->
> --> -->
> --> --> 2. able to adapt to new situation: able to change or be changed
> --> --> according to circumstances
> --> -->
> --> -->
> --> --> -----Original Message-----
> --> --> From: Murali Duvvury [mailto:murali@cisco.com]
> --> --> Sent: Friday, April 02, 2004 2:55 PM
> --> --> To: Beau James; bep@cisco.com; lma@cisco.com
> --> --> Cc: asweeney@cisco.com; murali@cisco.com;
> --> --> parser-police@cisco.com; uslennar@cisco.com
> --> --> Subject: Re: Approval for Flexlink CLI commands
> --> -->
> --> --> I am CCing our DSB Marketing Representative,
> --> -->
> --> --> Scott - could you comment on this one
> --> -->
> --> --> thanks
> --> --> murali
> --> -->
> --> --> At 02:06 PM 4/2/2004 -0800, Beau James wrote:
> --> --> >Also, is this likely to introduce marketing confusion, given
> --> --> >the long-standing "FlexWAN" product naming for 7600 WAN interface
> --> --> >cards?
> --> --> >Has DSB marketing talked with 7600 marketing?
> --> --> >
> --> --> >Beau
> --> --> >
> --> --> >--> From owner-parser-police@sj-core-2.cisco.com Fri Apr 2
> --> --> >--> 11:28:13
> --> --> >--> 2004
> --> --> >--> Date: Fri, 02 Apr 2004 11:28:07 -0800
> --> --> >--> From: Bruce Pinsky <bep@cisco.com>
> --> --> >--> To: "Lucern K. Ma" <lma@cisco.com>
> --> --> >--> CC: Adam Sweeney <asweeney@cisco.com>, parser-police@cisco.com,

```

> --> --> -->      murali Duvvury <murali@cisco.com>
> --> --> --> Subject: Re: Approval for Flexlink CLI commands
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> --> --> --> Hash: SHA1
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> Lucern K. Ma wrote:
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> | Hi Adam,
> --> --> --> |
> --> --> --> | At first we had "backup" instead of "flexlink". Then, it
> --> --> --> | was decided later by marketing here in DSBU.
> --> --> --> |
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> Have you checked with other groups that have or are
> --> --> --> planning similar functionality? Are they comfortable with this
> --> --> --> syntax?
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> As Adam suggests, we have standard accepted terms like
> --> --> --> "standby"
> --> --> --> and "backup" that are much more appropriate here. In fact,
> --> --> --> I don't see the reason that you would put this under the
> --> --> --> "switchport" parse chain at all when there is already a
> --> --> --> "backup interface" command available that
> --> --> --> should be
> --> --> --> utilized.
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> | Murali: Could you please help me answer Adam's question
> --> --> --> | as you were probably more involved in the naming of the
> --> --> --> feature?
> --> --> --> |
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> The marketing name of the feature and the command syntax
> --> --> --> are not inextricably linked.
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> - - -
> --> --> --> =====
> --> --> --> bep
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> --> --> --> Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (MingW32)
> --> --> -->
> --> --> --> iD8DBQFAbb7HE1XcgMgrtyYRAg6SAKDExA+pVgc8BvzKo5AetLQhOwNE5QC
> --> --> --> iD8DBQFAbb7HE1XcgMgrtyYRAg6SAKDExA+fbme
> --> --> --> iD8DBQFAbb7HE1XcgMgrtyYRAg6SAKDExA+t
> --> --> --> ywWr+qnfKfi+/KfSypQ5Lpw=
> --> --> --> =BFZV
> --> --> --> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
> --> --> -->
> --> -->
> --> -->
> -->
> -->
> -->
> -->

```